AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please amend the figures as shown in the enclosed replacement sheets. The attached sheet(s)

of drawings includes changes to make the drawings formal.

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claim 1 is independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1.

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the invention. Further, claims 2-21 have been amended to clarify the claim language, address typographical, grammatical, and/or antecedent basis issues. Support for the aforementioned amendments may be for example, in Figure 1 of the originally filed application. No new matter has been added by any of the aforementioned amendments.

Drawing Amendments

Applicants have amended the drawings to make them formal. No new matter has been added this amendment.

Priority

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging Applicants' claim of priority to the PCT/IB/2005/000559 and EP 04290597.6.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants thank the Examiner for reviewing the IDS filed on September 1, 2006.

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification for failing to include an abstract. The Applicants respectfully note that (i) the application is a national stage application of an international application (*i.e.,* a 371 application) and (ii) an abstract was published with the corresponding international application (*i.e.,* PCT/IB/2005/000559) under PCT Article 21. In view of this, the abstract published with the international application is sufficient to satisfy the abstract requirement of the USPTO. *See* MPEP 608.01(b). Accordingly, this objection is respectfully traversed and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Drawings

By way of this reply, the Applicants have prepared and included formal drawings. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 2-21 have been amended to replace "A retrievable token" with "The retrievable token." Further, claim 19 has been amended to include the term "list" as requested by the Examiner. In view of the above, withdrawal of the claim objections is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is directed to a machine (*i.e.,* a retrievable token), which is one of the enumerated classes of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Further, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the retrievable token is directed to a machine for at least the following reasons: (i) at least paragraph [0018] of the corresponding US Patent Application Publication (US 2007/0180517) describes the retrievable token as a physical device (such as a smart card) and (ii) at least claim 1 requires, in part, that the retrievable token includes at least one physical channel of communication with another apparatus. From the above, is clear that the retrievable token is a physical machine. Accordingly, claim 1 (and claims 2-21 depending therefrom) are directed to statutory subject matter. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2. With respect to claim 1, the basis for the Examiner's rejection is that claim 1 is directed to a method. Office Action mailed December 10, 2008, p. 4. As discussed above, claim 1 is directed to a machine. Thus, this rejection is not applicable to claim 1 and all claims depending therefrom. With respect to claims 2, 9 and 10, the aforementioned claims have been amended to address the antecedent basis issues raised by the Examiner. Accordingly, this rejection is now moot with respect to claims 2, 9, and 10. In view of the above, withdrawal of all of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,308,317 ("Wilkinson"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)." *See* MPEP § 2131.

Turning to the rejection, independent claim 1 requires, in part, (i) at least two logical channels of communication, (ii) where each logical channel of communication is associated with a different execution environment, and (iii) the different execution environments are located on the retrievable token. *See e.g.,* Specification, Figure 1.

Turning to the rejection, the Examiner contends that Wilkinson discloses the aforementioned limitations at col. 3, ll. 51-58, col. 4, ll. 60-67, col. 5, 41-57, and Fig. 11. Applicants disagree.

Specifically, Wilkinson discloses an integrated circuit card ("card") that includes a Java Virtual Machine (card JVM), which can interpret applications on the card. Wilkinson at col. 8, ll. 20-39. However, in order to execute the application on a card JVM, where the application was originally written for another type of JVM (*e.g.,* a JVM on a personal computer), the application must first be converted into a byte code representation understood by the card JVM. Wilkinson at col. 11, ll. 25-35.

Thus, while Wilkinson discloses the presence of two JVMs (namely, a card JVM and another JVM), the two JVMs do not execute on the card. Rather, the two JVMs execute on separate

devices. In particular, one JVM (*i.e.,* the card JVM) executes on the card while the other JVM executes on a device external to the card.

In view of the above, Wilkinson at least fails to disclose (i) at least two logical channels of communication, (ii) where each logical channel of communication is associated with a <u>different</u> execution environment, and (iii) the different execution environments are located on the retrievable token. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Wilkinson. Dependent claims are patentable over Wilkinson for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants believe this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number [09669/093001]).

Dated: May 11, 2009   Respectfully submitted,

                                                  By /Jonathan P. Osha/
                                                      Jonathan P. Osha
                                                      Registration No.: 33,986
                                                      OSHA · LIANG LLP
                                                      909 Fannin Street, Suite 3500
                                                      Houston, Texas 77010
                                                      (713) 228-8600
                                                      (713) 228-8778 (Fax)
                                                      Attorney for Applicants

Attachments (Replacement Sheets – 2 pages)